



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/673,351	09/30/2003	Sean J. Hart	NC 84,517	8470

26384 7590 12/19/2005

NAVAL RESEARCH LABORATORY  
ASSOCIATE COUNSEL (PATENTS)  
CODE 1008.2  
4555 OVERLOOK AVENUE, S.W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20375-5320

EXAMINER
----------

DRODGE, JOSEPH W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1723

DATE MAILED: 12/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/673,351

Applicant(s)

HART ET AL.

Examiner

Joseph W. Drodge

Art Unit

1723

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 10 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 10 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 0903.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 1723

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-9, drawn to a particle separator device, classified in class 250, subclass 251.
- II. Claim 10, drawn to an optical separation method using a laser, classified in class 210, subclass 748.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because:

Inventions II and I are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the apparatus can be utilized to practice separation processes where fluid and particles therein are flowing at relatively slow, steady velocities.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group I is not required for Group II, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Art Unit: 1723

During a telephone conversation with Tom Robbins on December 8, 2005 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-9. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claim 10 is withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims are replete with narrative, functional language that does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the claims and is indefinite; for example claim language in claim 1 concerning variation of laser power based on refractive index; claim 2 language concerning chemical compositions; claims 3-5 language concerning optical alignment and optical coupling, etc.

The claims are also replete with recitations both lacking nexus to other claim elements and lacking clear antecedent basis, a partial list as follows: claims 6-9 "the flowcell", claim 7 "the linear lens translator", claim 9 "the optical bench", "the microscope" and "the stage"; it is unclear whether such respective elements are positively recited as a part of the apparatus for which patent protection is sought. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 1723

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nishimura et al patent 5,495,105. Nishimura et al disclose apparatus for manipulating and separating particles employing light source 5 that may be a controlled power laser beam (column 2, lines 52-67), fluid pathway 2, flow cell 22, glass fluidic devices that include window or lens system 6 as well as plural windows 62-64 or 90a-d, 91 and 92 [as in claims 3,4 and 7], inlet reservoir 81, and outlet reservoirs 85 and 80 in a system including sandwiched windows or mirrors 90a-90d shown in figure 9 [as in claim 6]. It is unclear whether the narrative, functional language in claims 2 and 5 are adding any additional structural limitations.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

Art Unit: 1723

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishimura et al patent 5,495,105 in view of Zanger et al patent 6,317,449. Claim 8 differs in requiring the plural mirrors recited to be in the form of periscope mirror assembly. Zanger (column 5, lines 42-48). It would have been further obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated at least some of the mirrors in the figure 7 or figure 9 embodiment of Nishimura et al into a periscope mirror assembly, as suggested by Zanger, in order to make the plural mirrors independently adjustable and thus effect more precise imaging of the laser beam.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishimura et al patent 5,495,105 in view of Zanger et al patent 6,317,449, as applied to claim 8, and further in view of either of Wang et al patents 6,815,664 or 6,778,724. Claim 9 further differs in requiring the periscope mirrors to be associated with an optical bench or platform and with a microscope. Wang et al patents 6,815,664 and 6,778,724 are of particular interest with respect to claim 9 in that they describe laser particle separator devices employing optical platforms or benches and microscopes (see for instance

Art Unit: 1723

column 11, lines 32-47). It would have been further obvious to have incorporated optical bench and microscope to the particle separating/sorting assembly of Nishimura as modified by Zanger, to facilitate use of the assembly in analyzing the separated particles.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Ashkin patent 3,710,279 is representative of early basic prior art concerning devices for effecting particle movement and separation by laser beam employing multiple, movable laser sources and mirrors or reflectors. Weiner et al patent 6,490,533 is of further interest with respect to claims 8 and 9 as teaching additional details of periscope mirror assemblies.

Art Unit: 1723


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph Drodge at telephone number 571-272-1140. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wanda Walker, can be reached at 571-272-1151. The fax phone number for the examining group where this application is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either private PAIR or Public PAIR, and through Private PAIR only for unpublished applications. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have any questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JWD

December 8, 2005

  
JOSEPH DRODGE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER